



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/455,104	12/06/1999	RICHARD ALAN DAYAN	RP9-99-125	4653

25299 7590 10/06/2003

IBM CORPORATION
PO BOX 12195
DEPT 9CCA, BLDG 002
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

COLIN, CARL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2133

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/455,104

Applicant(s)

DAYAN ET AL.

Examiner

Carl Colin

Art Unit

2133

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 December 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Pursuant to USC 131, claims 1-12 are presenting for examination.

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the length is too short. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters "26" and "10" have both been used to designate a central processor on p.9, lines 19-20. Appropriate correction is required.

Figure 2 and figure 4 are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because figure 2 includes the reference numbers: 30, 32, 34 not mentioned in the description and figure 4

Art Unit: 2133

includes reference number 78 not mentioned in the description. Appropriate correction is required.

Figure 3 is objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because it does not include reference signs: reference number (26) in the description on p.10, line 11 and p.11, line 11 and reference number (89) in the description on p.10, line 19. Appropriate correction is required.

The drawings are objected to because the following reference numbers are not consistent with the drawings: reference number "24" on p.11, lines 2 and 9, reference number "90" on p.11, lines 6-7, and reference numbers "88" and "60" on p.11, lines 16. Applicant is required to carefully review the application to correct such errors.

A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification is required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.1 **Claims 1-5 and 7-9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,836,010 to **Kim**.

3.2 **As per claim 1, Kim** discloses a system for selectively securing a personal computer comprising a system unit including a first port dedicated to connecting an input device and a second port for connecting an other device (see column 3, lines 59-60 and column 4, lines 25-30); an input device connected to the system unit through the first port (see column 3, lines 59-60); a host controller that meets the recitation of a switch for selectively locking out user input, said switch connected to both the first port and the second port, with said switch operating to prevent user input both through the input device and through a device connected to the other port (see figure 2 and column 4, lines 35-37).

As per claim 2, Kim discloses the claimed system of claim 1 wherein the input device includes a keyboard connected to the system unit through a dedicated keyboard port and the switch includes means for simultaneously locking out user input to the system unit from the keyboard and from a device attached to the other port (see column 4, lines 25-38).

As per claim 3, Kim discloses the claimed system of claim 1 wherein the other port couples a standard input/output device to the system unit for communication and the switch prevents the standard input/output device coupled to the other port from communicating with the system unit when the input device is locked out against user input (see column 4, lines 25-38).
Kim discloses a keyboard as an input/output device.

As per claim 4, Kim discloses a method of operating a personal computer having a system unit with a first interface to a keyboard and an other interface through which an external device (a chip-in card) may also be coupled to the system unit (column 3, lines 1-21 and column 3, lines 55-67), the steps of the method comprising: providing a device for selectively locking out the keyboard, preventing user input at the keyboard from affecting the system unit (see column 5, lines 15-18); providing a lock on the other interface for selectively locking that interface against inputs from the external device from affecting the system unit (see column 3, lines 1-21 and column 4, lines 17-37 and 53-62); and coupling the switch on the other interface to the external device for selectively locking out the keyboard so that when the keyboard is locked out, an input from the external device is prevented from affecting the system unit (see column 3, lines 1-21 and column 4, lines 17-37 and 53-62). **Kim** further discloses how the input of the device can be controlled to lock the system unit (column 6, lines 18-29).

As per claim 5, Kim discloses the claimed method of claim 4 wherein the step of coupling the switch to selectively lock out the keyboard and an input from the external device occurs during the initial start up of the personal computer (column 6, lines 4-18).

3.4 **As per claim 7, Kim** discloses a computer system comprising: a keyboard, a processor connected by a system bus to the keyboard (column 3, lines 55-67); a first switch disposed between the keyboard and the processor to selectively prevent user inputs from the keyboard from being processed by the processor (see figures 1 and 2); an interface for connecting an input/output peripheral to the processor (see figures 1 and 2); and a host controller that meets the

recitation of a second switch connected between the interface to the input/output peripheral and the processor for selectively preventing input from the input/output processor from being processed by the processor; and a connection between said first switch and said second switch to coordinate the switching of the first and second switches so that when a user input at the keyboard is prevented from being processed at the processor, an input from the input/output peripheral is also prevented from being processed by the processor (see figure 2 and column 4, lines 35-38).

3.5 **As per claim 8, Kim** discloses the claimed system of claim 7, wherein the connection between the first and second switches also enables a user input at the input/output peripheral to be processed by the processor when the keyboard is enabled (column 5, lines 55-62).

3.6 **As per claim 9, Kim** discloses a computer system comprising: a keyboard for receiving a user input and transmitting it to a processor through a keyboard interface (column 3, lines 55-67); a processor coupled to the keyboard interface for receiving a user input at the keyboard (see figures 1 and 2); at least one bus port operatively coupled to the processor for providing an alternate connection for user input at an input device column 4, lines 1-16); a host controller that meets the recitation of a lock connected to keyboard and controlled for selectively preventing input to the processor from the keyboard, with said bus port also being coupled to the lock so that user input from the input device connected to at least one bus port is prevented from reaching, the processor when the lock prevents user inputs from the keyboard from reaching the processor (see figure 2 and column 4, lines 35-38).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.1 **Claims 11-12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,642,805 to **Tefft**.

4.2 **As per claim 11**, **Tefft** discloses a method of securing a personal computer which includes a processor operatively connected to a serial bus and to a keyboard, the steps of the method comprising: providing a lock associated with the keyboard for selectively preventing user inputs at the keyboard from being processed by the processor (column 3, lines 19-52); coupling the serial bus to the lock associated with the keyboard so that the keyboard and the serial bus are in the same state of being either locked or unlocked to user input at any time (column 3, lines 53-67).

4.3 **As per claim 12**, **Tefft** discloses the claimed method of claim 11. **Tefft** further discloses as prior art the step of further unlocking the keyboard and serial bus in response to the entry of an appropriate password at one of the keyboard and the serial bus (column 1, lines 35-46).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.1 **Claim 6** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,836,010 to **Kim** in view of US Patent 5,724,027 to **Shipman et al.**

5.2 **As per claim 6, Kim** substantially teaches a method of securing a personal computer including the steps of Claim 4. **Kim** does not explicitly teach that whenever the keyboard is secured against user input the steps of coupling the switch to selectively lock out the keyboard and input from the external device occurs. To a person with ordinary skill in the art it is apparent that whenever the keyboard is locked as **Kim** discloses the host controller receives the interrupt (column 4, lines 35-38) and all inputs are disabled. **Shipman et al.** in an analogous art teaches to operate the keyboard in different modes including a secured mode, said secured mode to control the system and data ports (column 7, lines 40-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

Art Unit: 2133

method of **Kim** to allow upon entry of the keyboard in a secured mode the control logic controls the system ports as taught by **Shipman et al.** This modification would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions provided by **Shipman et al.** to couple the switch to lock out inputs based on the keyboard secured mode so as to allow minimal functionality to be required of the keyboard controlling facility and reducing the cost as per **Shipman et al.** (column 2, lines 39-45).

6. **Claim 10** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,836,010 to **Kim** in view of US Patent 5,642,805 to **Tefft**.

6.1 **As per claim 10**, **Kim** substantially discloses the claimed method of claim 9. **Kim** does not explicitly teach the step of having the same locking and unlocking condition with the two lock systems. However, **Tefft** in an analogous art teaches a method where all the input devices are either locked or unlocked according to the locking and unlocking condition of the keyboard (column 3, lines 49-67 and column 4, lines 15-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of **Kim** to provide a condition where the two lock systems are either locked or unlocked as taught by **Tefft**. This modification would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions provided by **Tefft** so as prevent unauthorized users from accessing the unlocked system when the other is locked. The advantage is adding security.

Art Unit: 2133

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carl Colin whose telephone number is 703-305-0355. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday and every other Friday, 8:30-6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on 703-305-9595. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7239 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

cc

Carl Colin

Patent Examiner

September 29, 2003

Guy J. Lamare
for

Albert DeCady
Primary Examiner